

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MINOR CROP PROTECTION  
ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1992

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 3, 1992

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by more than 50 of our colleagues in introducing the Minor Crop Protection Assistance Act. This legislation is needed to ensure that minor crop growers continue to have access to those safe and effective crop protection chemicals they need.

Minor crops are fruits, vegetables, and other crops which are produced on less than 300,000 acres each a year. While these crops account for less than 2 percent of all the acreage planted in the United States annually, minor crops are not insignificant. So-called minor crops are a major contributor to the agricultural economy of many States and, more importantly, they are a major and vital part of the human diet.

Developing and registering pesticides for crop protection can be expensive. A complete data set—the information on the safety of the product, and its possible effect on consumers, workers and the environment—can cost millions of dollars to prepare. Residue data alone for a crop can cost more than \$100,000.

Pesticide manufacturers are shying away from investing in the research and development of products that are intended for use on minor crops because of their limited market.

Nor is this problem always limited to the minor crops. It is also happening to some pesticides intended for use on major crops—such as wheat, corn, soybeans, and cotton—where a pest problem is not widespread and the potential market for the product is relatively small.

Reregistering a product that is currently registered for use on minor crops is also costly. The 1988 amendments to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) require EPA to initiate a process to update the registrations of pesticides that had been registered prior to November 1, 1984. As a result of this process, registrants must update the data supporting their registrations, and, where this information is lacking, perform new studies or gather new data to fill the data gaps.

When companies weigh the costs of developing this new data versus the potential profits from minor crop pesticide sales, some are deciding to voluntarily cancel the registration rather than seek renewal.

Mr. Speaker, minor crop pesticides are important to agricultural production in all 50 States. These pest management tools are particularly vital to the continued production of fruits and vegetables. Often overlooked is the fact that minor crop pesticides are critical components of many integrated pest management (IPM) systems currently in place to control ag-

ricultural pests in an environmentally prudent manner.

The legislation we have introduced will help maintain minor use pesticide registrations. Just as important, our bill will do so in a way that does not compromise the health and safety standards for farm workers, consumers, and the environment that are currently in place under FIFRA.

Our proposal is designed to provide a number of options to EPA for registering existing pesticides and promoting new minor use registrations. These options include:

Waive certain data requirements if the pesticide's use does not present an unreasonable risk to human health or the environment;

Grant extensions for developing data in certain cases;

Require the expedited review of applications for registration for minor uses; and

Use of data from an identical or substantially similar pesticide whose registration has been allowed to lapse for economic reasons.

In no instance would these mechanisms be allowed to be used if EPA's Administrator has determined that the pesticide poses an unreasonable adverse risk to human health or the environment, or where the missing data are essential for making such a determination.

The Congressional Research Service, at my request, reviewed this bill's impact on current safety standards. They have concurred that existing health and safety standards under FIFRA would not be compromised by this bill.

Members of the House should be aware that the Committee on Agriculture is preparing to grapple with the difficult issues associated with pesticide regulation and use. Our Subcommittee on Department Operations, Research, and Foreign Agriculture, under the able leadership of Subcommittee Chairman CHARLIE ROSE, has held extensive hearings on the subject and is preparing for subcommittee markup.

The legislation I have introduced addresses an important issue in this debate. However, I recognize that other improvements in the regulation and use of pesticides, particularly for minor crops, are needed.

For example, USDA's handling of pesticide issues, including the Department's pesticide data collection efforts, need improvement. In addition, USDA has been slow to develop and implement the recordkeeping provisions of the 1990 farm bill as they pertain to restricted-use pesticides.

According to the findings of a GAO study I requested, the Department's IR-4 Program management needs improvement. IR-4 can be a useful tool in securing and maintaining pesticide registrations for minor crop uses. Unfortunately, the IR-4 program has suffered from a lack of resources and leadership to date.

USDA also needs to establish a more effective system for providing advance warning to producers of changes in the availability of pest

control chemicals due to registration decisions by EPA and pesticide registrants. In addition, USDA has been slow to investigate and identify alternative pest control strategies which place less reliance on chemical approaches such as IPM strategies. This situation must change. Finally, measures must be found to accelerate EPA registration of biological pest control agents and to promote the development of safer pesticides.

I look forward to working with Mr. ROSE and the other members of the committee in addressing these and other pesticide issues this year.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Minor Crop Farmers Alliance and their many members from the ranks of individual agricultural producers, their commodity organizations, and other farm groups for their help and support in drafting this important legislation.

A summary of the provisions of the Minor Crop Protection Assistance Act follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF MINOR  
CROP PROTECTION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1992

Section 1 and 2. Short Title and Findings.—Provides a short title and findings.

Section 3. Minor Use.—Defines the term "minor use" as the use of a pesticide on a total of fewer than 300,000 acres or a use that does not provide sufficient economic incentive to support registration, if the use has not been determined to pose an unreasonable risk to human health or the environment.

Section 4. Minor Use Waiver.—Allows the EPA Administrator to waive certain data requirements for a minor use only if the Administrator determines that the minor use does not present an unreasonable risk to human health or the environment.

Section 5. Exclusive Data Use.—Provides 10 years of protection for registration data, submitted after the date of enactment of this bill, that relates solely to the registration of a minor use.

Section 6. Expediting Minor Use Registrations.—Requires the Administrator to complete the review of applications for registrations of certain minor uses within 6 months. Also, preserves the full time period for submitting data if a data waiver that is submitted in good faith is denied.

Section 7. Time Extensions for Development of Minor Use Data.—Authorizes the Administrator to extend the deadlines by 4 years for the submission of data to support a minor use registration if adequate data has been or is being submitted to support other uses of the pesticide and if the registrant submits a satisfactory data production schedule. However, the Administrator is prohibited from extending the deadline if the Administrator determines that the minor use may pose unreasonable adverse effects during the extension period or that available data is insufficient to determine the risk associated with such minor use.

Section 8. Conditional Registration for Minor Uses.—Directs the Administrator to provide conditional amendments to pesticide registrations to permit additional minor uses of certain pesticides, provided such uses do not significantly increase any risks associated with the pesticide.

\* This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Section 9. Temporary Extension of Registration for Unsupported Minor Uses.—Temporarily prohibits the Administrator from taking any action with regard to an unsupported minor use of a pesticide until the final deadline for submitting data with respect to other uses of the pesticides that the registrant is supporting (and providing data for).

Section 10. Utilization of Data for Voluntarily Canceled Chemicals.—Allows EPA to utilize data from an identical or substantially similar pesticide that has been voluntarily cancelled for economic reasons within 2 years to support the registration of an identical or substantially similar minor use.

Section 11. Environmental Protection Agency Minor Use Program.—Directs EPA to establish a minor use program within the Office of Pesticides Programs to coordinate minor use issues.

Section 12. Department of Agriculture Minor Use Program.—Directs USDA to coordinate its responsibilities by establishing a minor use program. Also, authorizes the establishment of a minor use matching fund to help ensure the continued availability of minor use chemicals.

## INTRODUCING A BILL TO PROTECT THE TATSHENSHINI AND ELSEK RIVERS

**HON. WAYNE OWENS**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 3, 1992

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to focus our attention on a threat to one of the most spectacular and pristine areas on Earth. Geddes Resources, Ltd., of Toronto, is proposing one of the biggest open pit copper mines in North America in British Columbia, just 15 miles from the United States border and Glacier Bay National Park, in one of the wildest areas on Earth. Besides desecration of 100 miles of road and a dozen major bridges across the river and streams, drainage from the mine will flow downstream into the United States and Glacier Bay National Park. Protecting the Tatshenshini and the Alsek from this improper development will also mean protecting Glacier Bay National Park on the U.S. side of the border from environmental damage, and even possible ecological catastrophe, with a 360-foot-high earthen dam holding back a 4-mile lake of toxic waste water in one of the world's most seismically active zones, with some of the most productive fisheries in Alaska directly downstream.

My bill will put a spotlight on a situation that has not yet received enough attention. It will require that the United States pursue negotiations on several fronts with the Canadian Government to protect the resource. The bill calls on the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the Canadian Government to protect the resources of the region, and requires a study by the National Park Service of the potential impacts of the Windy Craggy Mine. It also calls on the Secretary of State to work with Canada to refer this proposed development to the International Joint Commission which will take a comprehensive look at the potential adverse environmental and social impacts of the mine. Finally, the bill calls for the United

States to seek the cooperation of Canada to obtain world heritage site status for this remarkable area.

There is significant opposition to the Geddes project in Canada, both at the provincial and national level, and this resolution can serve as a rallying point for action in both our countries.

We are building a strong coalition of diverse interests against this misguided proposal, uniting economic, recreational, esthetic, and ethical interests, including the United Fisherman of Alaska, Yak-Tat Kwann Native Corp., the United States National Park Service, and the environmental community of the United States and Canada. Tatshenshini International is made up of over 50 groups, with over 5 million members.

Although the mine site is in Canada, the United States Government has vital interests to protect: Glacier Bay National Park, and the fisheries at the mouth of the Alsek River. Damage to the fisheries would devastate local economies and the subsistence culture of native Americans. Working through both the Interior and the Foreign Affairs Committee, we will negotiate with Canada to protect this resource, and we will bring a focus to the mine project before it is too late to stop it.

The Tatshenshini and the Alsek are among the most spectacular and pristine rivers on earth, nominated for world heritage status, and singled out by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature for the quality of their environment. This is one of the great river trips in the world and a great recreational resource, in large part because of its wildness and solitude. The scenery on the Tatshenshini and the Alsek is astounding. It is one of the premiere, irreplaceable wild places on Earth, teeming with unmolested wildlife, including brown bears and wolves. There is no sign of man for 2 weeks on the river, except for one abandoned cabin. And, 20 miles from the coast, is Alsek Bay, one of the single most spectacular places on Earth, with immense glaciers calving into the iceberg filled Alsek River.

This river system, with its surrounding 15,000-foot mountains and dozens of glaciers, is a true temple of rock and ice, unique in all the world. Unless we act, this land and its fish and wildlife will be irrevocably scarred by this development. A mine on this colossal scale will pollute water in the rivers and streams, and bring more than 100 miles of road and bridges into one of the least disturbed areas on Earth.

This is perhaps the most spectacular, and threatened, river system on Earth, and it will be prominently featured on American Rivers annual list of most endangered rivers next week. This legislation already has the support of GEORGE MILLER, the chairman of the Interior Committee, as well as every subcommittee chair. I understand that Senator GORE will introduce a companion resolution shortly in the Senate.

As rich as this area admittedly is in mineral resources, it is rich in other resources as well, resources that should never be put at risk. There are some values simply too price less to put up for sale.

## ESSAYS BY AMERICAN INDIANS

**HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA**

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 3, 1992

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, through Public Law 102-188 (S.J. Res. 217, H.J. Res. 342), Congress and the President designated 1992 as the Year of the American Indian. This law pays tribute to the people who first inhabited the land now known as the continental United States. Although only symbolic, this gesture is important because it shows there is sympathy in the eyes of the majority of both Houses of the Congress for those Indian issues which we as a Congress have been struggling with for over 200 years.

In support of the Year of the American Indian, and as part of my ongoing series this year, I am providing for the consideration of my colleagues two essays written by American Indians and published by the Falmouth Institute in its March 1992 edition of the "American Indian Report." These essays are part of a series being published by the Falmouth Institute this year.

[From American Indian Report, Mar. 1992]

"Once begun, the tide of change, precipitated by Columbus' arrival, has forever impacted the native people of this country. Native American history, since Columbus, is laden with acts of destruction, displacement and deprivation. Despite this oppression, American Indian peoples have continued to endure and are experiencing a social and cultural resurgence which itself should be celebrated."

The Falmouth Institute asked a selected group of educators, tribal administrators, students, attorneys, social workers and business owners to reflect on the above quotation and write an essay on what the last 500 years have meant to the original inhabitants of this land.

Each month the American Indian Report is featuring those essays written by Native Americans from all walks of life.

### 500 YEARS SINCE COLUMBUS

(By Pamela G. Mendoza-Reece)

It has only been 500 years since that momentous event of the landing of Columbus. Within that time a race of people has almost reached extinction, as have the once numerous buffalo.

We have been exploited, degraded and disregarded as mere insignificant creatures. Nothing to be concerned about.

We have also allowed ourselves to become the stereotype that the white man has labeled us as: lazy, alcoholic, unintelligent and worthless people.

We have not assimilated into this nation that was once ours as we should have. Now we have become social outcasts, pushed to the side as if we were non-existent or as if we can be forgotten.

In order to continue to exist, we must all learn to take the knowledge and technology that is available and use it to our benefit. We must make a place for our children whose future greatly depends on our struggle to survive in this society.

We must release ourselves from the outside controls that so many of our brothers and sisters fall into and use that energy towards a positive life before it is too late.

I am a proud Nez Perce Native American. I am learning about my culture and regain-



ing a pride that was almost lost. I broke away from the degradation, humiliation and alcoholism that has plagued my family. I remember the short lives of many of my family members that were brought to the point of not caring, addiction, loss of self-pride and then self-destruction.

Who will cry and remember us? Or will there be anyone left?

Ne mee Poo Nez Perce

(The author is a student at the Seattle Indian Center in Seattle, Wash.)

#### 500 YEARS SINCE COLUMBUS

(By William W. Miller, Jr.)

The cockroach is truly a relative of ours. It has been exposed to many different kinds of adversity, but it still lives on.

We, the aboriginal people of these two continents, still have our fair share of adversaries (including our own people), but we have our spiritual beliefs handed down since the beginning of time. We will depend on these spiritual beliefs to carry us and our generations to come for thousands of years, provided non-natives will heed our ancient beliefs and preserve this earth.

Many diseases have been brought to us, but we're still here. Some of these non-natives were bright enough to utilize some of our spiritual ways to combat diseases like alcoholism. Alcoholics Anonymous uses the spiritual beliefs of native people.

Democracy is now being put in the hands of people across the pond, but we formulated it first. Some people use the term "family unit," but we already know about it because we are all related: every tribe, every plant, the sky, the water, the rocks \* \* \* the whole environment.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs tried to divide and conquer, but we are still here.

Many of our ancestors have given their last full measure of devotion—the Revolutionary War, Civil War, World War I, World War II, the Korean War and Vietnam—for us to get this far. Now it is our turn, what are we willing to do?

It's time for our people to make a change. When our children, from preschool on up, sit with computers on one hand and the grandparents' knowledge on the other, then we can look forward to changes. Our sacrifices and prayers for a thousand years down the "Red Path" will come to pass with peace and harmony.

Columbus made a fatal mistake. I hope his relatives and followers don't do the same. These sickly immigrants failed to see the real nature of our people. After our people nourished them back to health, they forgot. They should have assimilated, but our people don't impose their will on others because we believe their spirit is strong also.

Our spirit is strong today. 500 years after Columbus, because we have been able to maintain our culture. Some of our people still worship in places in the Black Hills and the Badlands.

We have enough spiritual strength to hold this earth together. Some of us want to share this power with our non-native brothers and sisters.

Are they in a position to learn?

Will they pass these messages on without the exchange of money?

Are they willing to honor the treaties?

(The author is a member of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe.)

#### CONSTITUENT WRITES LETTER TO PRESIDENT BUSH

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 3, 1992

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, last November one of my constituents, Mr. Frank DeBritz, wrote an excellent letter to the President regarding his approach to our domestic problems. I received a copy of this correspondence recently and after reading the content, felt it should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for others to read. The letter reads as follows:

MANLIUS, NY,

November 7, 1991.

DEAR PRESIDENT BUSH: I have been impressed by your leadership and stewardship and have not regretted having voted for you. I do believe, however, that your efforts in the foreign policy arena are not matched by your domestic agenda. In the final analysis, this will be the important issue in 1992. I feel that you badly need a comprehensive domestic program which shows creativity and vision and which will captivate the minds of the people. This program can't depend on the Russian bogeymen or any external threat but must address fundamental issues and adverse trends within our own borders, within our collective psyche which have been at work for longer than your administration. Since I believe that another four years of your administration will be beneficial for the country, I am writing this somewhat lengthy treatise to be constructively helpful in achieving that end.

First, let me deal with a fundamental gut issue, jobs. America has been exporting manufacturing jobs abroad for almost two decades and replacing them with service jobs. These service jobs are generally low paying and provide relatively little incentive to move away from public assistance for those on the low end of the scale. Consequently, the mobility which has fueled America's energy for generations has become much more difficult and this fact is disenfranchising a growing percentage of the population. If a large minority of our population feels it cannot move to a better socio-economic position in its lifetime or that of its children, it will either give up or go outside the law. Either one of these outcomes tends to destabilize a Democracy. Moreover, a country which increasingly relies on others for their fundamental goods and increasingly becomes a service economy tends to be subservient in the limit. Our economy was in stagnation when President Reagan was elected. It was revitalized primarily by a large defense build-up and modernization program. Now that we have won the cold war and are reducing this budget drastically our economy is sputtering. I believe that we as a nation don't realize how greatly our economy depends on the defense industry. Its no accident that the balance of payments always goes more negative at this time of year than expected since most things that the vast majority of the people buy at Christmastime are no longer made in the USA. It's time to realize that while seizing the peace, we also need a new thrust into products and programs that people will use and that we can manufacture here. This manufacture must be accompanied by a new set of training programs that force a broader profile of the people into the work place.

#### JOB FORMATION

At the heart of the job formation issue is the reduction of relatively unskilled good paying jobs. This trend combined with the high cost of a college education portends an economic polarization of our society. To combat this a new 50 billion, ten year program should be announced. This program will involve the construction of a new transportation system for six megacenters. I suggest that centers might be as follows: 1) New York, 2) Greater Boston, 3) Philadelphia, Washington, Baltimore, 4) Los Angeles, 5) Chicago and 6) New Orleans. The vehicle for letting contracts to specify, design and construct these systems would be a NASA like organization. Qualifiers for such contracts should be consortia of aerospace, transportation and construction companies. This program would be kicked-off in FY '93 and be funded by the reduction of the defense budget. The solution systems will have quantitative measures of performance to decrease energy requirements, pollution and user costs. Firms winning these contracts will be competitors for the commercial operation of the systems for the first 10 years of operation.

Further, we must drive our country to less energy dependency on foreign suppliers. The governing principle, here, is that as long as the sun shines there is no energy shortage just difficulty in its means of delivery. Along these lines a new solar energy conversion program should be announced. Again consortia of energy companies, aerospace companies and construction companies should be encouraged to compete for solar energy conversion facilities. Five sites should be designated. I suggest the following for priority: Dallas-Forth Worth, San Diego, Phoenix, Miami and Albuquerque. The five year goal shall be to provide 80% of the electric power for those areas by direct solar conversion. Again the companies which provide the systems would qualify to provide the energy for the next 10 years to the region. An approximate cost for this project would be 25 billion, over ten-year period. The goal would be to create at least one fully operational site by 1996 and all five by the turn of the century.

#### COST OF MEDICAL CARE, DEGENERATIVE DISEASE RESEARCH AND BIOTECH INDUSTRY SUPPORT

Another gut issue addresses the aged and medical care in general. The high cost of medical care is almost at the strangulation point. An underlying cost driver is the size and frequency of malpractice suits. To combat this we need a new set of laws. First, the Congress must pass a law which puts an absolute ceiling on malpractice suits, I suggest \$250,000. A Physician found guilty of malpractice twice in three years will have his license revoked for one year while he is retrained and must pass a re-examination to be reinstated. Secondly, legislation should be passed which sets up a new public non-profit corporation. This corporation will administer a fund to which all workers 40 years of age or above could choose to contribute until retirement. The fund would provide nursing care for people who (a) reach 70 years of age and request such care or (b) have a brain degenerative disease and are over the age of 60, Social Security funds, for which such people who enter this care are eligible, would be automatically paid into the fund. This non-profit corporation would never transfer funds to any general fund.

The last leg of this medical program would address the high cost of diagnostic equipment, hospitalization and care of degenerative diseases. To combat this a program with

these government initiatives should be undertaken. First, a systems approach to the creation of a hospital with its appropriate data collection and testing equipment would be taken. A five billion dollar program over five years should be initiated. The government would let five contracts of \$1 billion dollars each to specify, design and construct five complexes. The sites would be selected based on municipalities' proposals to provide matching funds on a 25% basis. Second, a directed biotech approach to the solution of degenerative diseases such as Alzheimers, cancer and AIDS would be enabled. The goal is a cure or at least arrestment of such diseases in five years. The program would provide (a) matching funds for biotech companies involved in such research, (b) tax incentives for construction of domestic manufacturing facilities. Third a tax incentive should be given to firms creating new domestic manufacturing facilities for medical diagnostic equipment and medical instruments. The later 2 initiatives would be arbitrarily sized at \$2 billion a year.

#### EDUCATION PROGRAM

To address your education issue, we must be very circumspect. Simply throwing money at the education system will not make it improve. It appears that our ability to train our children in the fundamentals of science, mathematics and language has decreased radically. The root cause of this decline is debatable, but it arguably starts with the training of the trainers. It is no secret that the best students of science and math do not choose elementary and secondary education as a career. Accordingly, I suggest a billion dollar program a year to provide \$20K/year to individuals who are math, science or engineering majors and who agree to take primary or secondary education jobs for at least 3 years after graduation from college. These students would have to take an education minor to qualify but would not be required to stay in the teaching ranks past 3 years if they so choose. A new curriculum worked out in cooperation with 10 universities across the nation to prepare for such combined degree programs would be defined in the next year. The \$20K would be granted to students on a yearly basis to pay tuition and would require a grade of B or above to maintain.

#### TAX CUTS

Lastly, a tax program is proposed that would stimulate the economy but also would be equitable. I propose serious consideration of the following: A flat 18% tax on all taxable income over \$20,000. Deductions would be limited to primary and secondary mortgages and dependents. This would greatly simplify the tax collection process, lower its costs and eliminate any tax burden for those whose income is not sufficient to survive. Capital gains and any other income would be treated as a normal income. I would also eliminate all other sources of non-taxable income for individuals. Corporations would be granted tax credits for such programs as outlined above.

#### SUMMARY

The above suggestions have the following benefits:

- (a) Involves regions of the country that are likely to be hard hit by defense cut backs and/or the loss of manufacturing jobs.
- (b) Addresses large segments of the population being hurt by skyrocketing medical costs.
- (c) Encourages domestic manufacturing in product areas where the USA appears to have technological or know-how leadership.

(d) Provides a directed education program and economic aid which can help all socio-economic strata.

(e) Provides a tax policy which is balanced.

(f) Can be targeted geographically to obtain a broad political consensus.

The above programs are estimated to be in the \$10 to \$128 annual cost range. Should this estimate be optimistic by a factor of two, we are still in the \$25 billion a year range. This money might easily be furnished by defense budget cutbacks and diversion of some funds from existing programs, if necessary. The net cost of the recommended programs could be significantly less if the velocity of money and the spawned industry generates more tax revenue which should occur.

I hope that these ideas are useful to you and your advisors and helpful in stimulating a thought process that leads to a successful domestic program.

Sincerely,

FRANK DEBRITZ.

#### THE SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY AT SOUTH BEND

#### HON. TIMOTHY J. ROEMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 3, 1992

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasures of holding this office is the ability to share in the great triumphs of my constituency. Nowhere is that privilege more exciting and important than in noting great works in education, because education is the key to our future and the world we leave our children.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the silver anniversary of an institution of higher learning that has been serving the greater South Bend-Mishawaka area for 25 years. The Indiana University at South Bend has been an integral part of our community for both the local residents, and others who have come to take part in the studies there.

IUSB has a strong educational foundation, rooted in civic duty and cultural awareness. Its hallmarks are quality and diversity, and its very presence enhances the quality of life in northern Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, the Michiana region is blessed with a number of fine learning institutions. IUSB proudly stands shoulder to shoulder with each of them, and is known for its success in demanding and receiving the highest quality of teaching and teaching results. Indeed, the administration, faculty, and staff all display the qualities of dedication, caring, hard work and foresight that make up any high caliber college.

IUSB continues to grow and prosper. Never satisfied with the status quo, this school continues to earn growing respect from the community, the region, and from beyond the State boundaries. Newly endowed chairs and departments are normal here, as the school balances sensible growth with the constant demands of nurturing curious minds and fulfilling an ambitious cultural agenda.

IUSB is a complete university, which places a high priority on the counseling, health and residential needs of its community. As the student body grows and diversifies, the university's services continue to as well. Such needs

as child care provide for more learning opportunities for more individuals, and place IUSB in the forefront of modern institutional management.

Mr. Speaker, IUSB offers a full plate of educational programs and majors, from the arts to education, from business to nursing, from women's studies to foreign opportunities, and so much more. Many of their students and programs have won honors and awards; many more will continue to do so. The comprehensive array of opportunity here continues to grow and refine itself under enlightened guidance.

Mr. Speaker, with a 25-year record of accomplishment and achievement, the people of IUSB could be content to rest on their laurels and bask in satisfaction. But I know they will never do this. The first quarter century was just a beginning, and IUSB will continue to mature and evolve as a learning center, community member, and home for extended academic awareness.

It is with great pleasure that I salute them today.

#### ERROR IN THE BOSTON GLOBE

#### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 3, 1992

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD two letters which I have sent today correcting an error in an editorial of the Boston Globe. That factually incorrect editorial was sent to all Members in a Dear Colleague letter on March 30, 1992, by Mr. THOMAS of California.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE

AND CIVIL SERVICE,

Washington, DC, April 3, 1992.

Hon. WILLIAM M. THOMAS,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR BILL: I have just read your "Dear Colleague" letter in which you copied a March 20, 1992, editorial from the Boston Globe. I am disappointed that you would disseminate an editorial among our colleagues containing a significant error made by the editors of the Boston Globe. Although the Committee which I chair has "Post Office" in its title, the statement in the editorial that I am "chairman of the committee that oversees the House Post Office" is totally false. As the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on House Administration, you know that the Committee on House Administration, not the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, has oversight responsibility over the House Post Office. I would have hoped that you would not have perpetuated that erroneous statement by copying the editorial in your letter without any clarifying language.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. CLAY,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE

AND CIVIL SERVICE,

Washington, DC, April 3, 1992.

EDITOR,  
The Boston Globe,  
Boston, MA.

DEAR EDITOR: Your editorial concerning congressional mail which appeared in the



Boston Globe on Friday, March 20, 1992, contained a glaring error involving my name and the Committee which I chair. You stated in the editorial, "Rep. Bill Clay of Missouri, the chairman of the committee that oversees the House Post Office. . . ." That statement is absolutely false. Although "Post Office" is in the title of the Committee I chair, the Committee on House Administration, not the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, has the responsibility for oversight of the House Post Office. I hope that you will correct that error and refrain from perpetuating it.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. CLAY,  
Chairman

## HEALTH CARE IS A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 3, 1992

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, our health care system is sick—we have heard the statistics before—37 million Americans are uninsured. Millions more are underinsured. This growing number of Americans lacking access to adequate health care coverage is a national scandal.

Over the past few years, we have heard quite a lot of talk about changing our health care system; reform is vital. The status quo is no longer acceptable. Too many people are falling through the cracks because they are unable to afford the rising costs of health care. How can we allow millions of Americans to live in fear of a long-term illness, to live in fear of having their hard-won financial and emotional resources wiped out. Numerous proposals have been introduced attempting to solve our ailing health care system. But, the bottom line is health care is not a privilege, but a right of every man, woman, and child, and I am not taking second opinions on this diagnosis.

Today, I am introducing a concurrent resolution stating that health care is a fundamental right of every person in the United States.

The Japanese have established health care as a right, so have the Germans, the French, and the Swedish; in fact every industrialized country, except South Africa has established such a policy.

We would never turn away a first grader from receiving an education, nor should we turn away a 2-year-old from receiving immunization. We are living in a country which forces older Americans to choose between filling a prescription or paying their rent. We are living in a country where many pregnant women do not receive adequate prenatal care.

The time is long overdue that health care be established as a fundamental right.

I invite my colleagues to support this legislation and establish this as national policy.

## FERTILITY CLINIC SUCCESS RATE AND CERTIFICATION ACT OF 1991

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 3, 1992

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. LENT and myself, I rise today to introduce legislation that will protect the public and establish accountability in the burgeoning infertility treatment business.

This is not a new issue. In fact, I have pursued a solution to these problems for 4 years, introducing a succession of four bills to accomplish what everyone involved has agreed must be done. The legislation I am introducing today reflects amendments recommended by witnesses in a February 27 Health and Environment Subcommittee hearing on my previous bill, H.R. 3940.

The first people to blow the whistle on infertility scams were the fertility professionals themselves. For years now, leaders in the infertility field have sounded the alarm bell about the exploitation of consumers. For example, in the November 1987 issue of *Fertility and Sterility*, appeared an editorial entitled "Are We Exploiting the Infertile Couple?" This landmark statement of professional principles was authored by 11 of the most distinguished fertility specialists in the United States.

They stated that—

The lack of standards and absence of a credentialing process with [In Vitro Fertilization] is disturbing—

And expressed concern that—

the motive for establishing [some infertility] programs may be [little more than . . . an attempt by a hospital corporation to increase its market share.

But these whistleblowing experts reserved their most telling criticism for their colleagues who exaggerated pregnancy success rates and misled couples seeking help at infertility clinics. They stated that:

Infertile patients often develop unrealistically high expectations regarding specific therapies. The medical community is partly responsible for these inflated expectations when practitioners claim pregnancy rates that far exceed those found in the current literature. . . .

[For example,] patients are often not told that the practitioner has limited experience or success with this operative procedure or is quoting another surgeon's statistics . . . we strongly advise that each surgeon present his or her own pregnancy rates in talking with patients about surgery.

This expert assessment of the state of the art in the infertility business is best summed up in their own words:

Considering that half of the IVF programs that have been established in the country have no pregnancies, it would seem that the standards of practice are quite variable.

Mr. Speaker, infertility is a major public health concern today. With a steadily increasing incidence of sexually transmitted diseases, and the trend toward delayed childbearing, it can only become a more serious concern in the future. Already, there are millions of infertile

American couples, desperate to have children, who may fall prey to these poor standards of practice. Even under the best of circumstances, these anxious couples face invasive medical procedures, the risk of dangerous complications, and low pregnancy success rates.

My investigation of this field uncovered many disturbing examples of frustrated, emotionally drained couples who were exploited and misled by those who took advantage of their faith in modern medicine.

Couples seeking help for an infertility problem are bombarded with advertising claims which have touted success rates of 30, 40, 50 percent or more. They don't know that a minority of clinics are responsible for the most successful IVF births, let alone which clinics have the best track record in treating patients with their specific infertility problem. And they don't even know that there's no one watching to make sure that these facilities meet even minimal quality controls.

I am pleased to say that since the first congressional hearings probing these problems in June 1988, the major consumer and professional organizations have worked together to take action on the problems we found. Their efforts deserve praise, and are clearly a step in the right direction.

But there is much more to do. The voluntary programs now in place have virtually no leverage against questionable practitioners, who are doing genuine harm to the public.

In an effort to remedy this, Mr. LENT and I drafted this legislation that stipulates the following:

First, all fertility clinics would be required to report their pregnancy success rates, in line with the uniform definitions worked out by the Secretary in consultation with the Centers for Disease Control.

Second, the Federal Government would annually publish these pregnancy success rates in a consumer guide booklet, noting where appropriate the clinics which had failed to report some or all of their success rates.

Third, all fertility clinics would also be required to identify the embryo laboratories that they rely on for lab work. This information would also be published in the Secretary's annual consumer guide.

Fourth, the HHS Secretary would develop a model program for the inspection and certification of embryo labs, and promulgate this model certification program to every State for their consideration and adoption.

Fifth, if a State should fail to implement the model certification program, either directly or through a private accreditation organization approved by the HHS Secretary, the Federal Government would report this fact to the public in its annual consumer guide. But under our bill, embryo labs operating in a State that did not adopt the model certification program could still get certified by an accreditation organization which has been approved by the Secretary, and have their certification status published in the annual consumer guide.

Some may ask why the public needs this bill, since many fertility clinics already report some version of success rates to their professional society. But current reporting by clinics is voluntary, and there is no reason for a questionable practitioner to report anything, because there are no consequences.

This legislation would empower infertile couples by giving them a consumer guide in which the clinics with low-success rates, or those that don't report, will be exposed. Couples, for the first time, would have the tools to be informed consumers, and can either avoid these clinics, or to ask the clinic administrators to supply them with the missing success rate information.

Mr. Speaker, this whole bill is predicated on the well-accepted idea that consumers, empowered with good, sound information about patient outcomes, can reward the best fertility clinics by taking their business to those with good success rates, and avoid those with poor success rates or uncertified labs, or which simply fail to report their experience.

The legislation involves no unfunded Federal or State costs. The States and the Federal Government would be authorized to assess fees so that clinics would pay for the quality assurance program.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, there are many honorable and compassionate health care professionals working in the fertility field. But the infertility business is booming. The lure of deep pockets will attract many entrepreneurs less interested in health care than in cashing in on hopeful couples' willingness to pay for a chance to have a family. The legislation we are considering today will establish a meaningful set of consumer protections to help these couples get what they want most—a child.

As the sponsor of this legislation, I would like to thank several additional people, especially Chairman HENRY WAXMAN and Dr. Louis Sullivan and Dr. Bill Roper, who have been most gracious in helping me think through the best way to assist infertile couples with this legislation. In addition, several members and staff from professional societies and consumer groups worked hard with me to perfect this legislation over the past several weeks, particularly Lynne Lawrence and Dr. Robert Visscher, M.D., of the American Fertility Society. Finally, I owe a great debt of gratitude to the professionalism and expertise of Health and Environment Subcommittee staff Ruth Katz and Mike Hash, and Mr. LENT's minority staff, Mary McGrane and Melody Hughson.

#### MINOR CROP PROTECTION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1992

**HON. LEON E. PANETTA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 3, 1992

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, Representative KIKI DE LA GARZA, and over 50 of my House colleagues in co-sponsoring the Minor Crop Protection Assistance Act of 1992.

As a member from one of the most bountiful districts in the State of California, I represent a region that includes some of the most productive fruit and vegetable farmland in the country. The many fruits and vegetables grown in my district, which include broccoli, asparagus, and strawberries, are referred to as minor or specialty crops.

These crops are important not only to California but to the Nation's economy as well. Approximately \$35 billion in fruit, vegetable, and horticultural crops are produced annually in the United States. Exports of specialty crops amounted to about \$5 billion in 1990 which is 12.5 percent of the \$40 billion in total agricultural exports. In addition to their economic importance, fruits and vegetables have taken on an increasingly significant nutritional role in our diets as Americans have become more health conscious.

This legislation will address concerns that are of specific interest to the minor use industry by preserving the availability of safe pesticides for these small acre crops. This measure will provide options for pesticide manufacturers, farmers, and the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], which regulates pesticide use, for continuing or developing new uses for pesticides to protect minor uses.

These provisions include: waiving certain data requirements if the pesticide's use does not present an unreasonable risk to human health or the environment; granting extensions for developing data in certain cases; requiring expedited review of applications for registration for minor crop uses; and using data from an identical or substantially similar pesticide whose registration has been allowed to lapse for economic reasons. These mechanisms would not be permitted if EPA determined that the pesticide in question posed an unreasonable adverse risk to human health or the environment, or where the missing data were considered essential for making such a determination.

As my colleagues know, both the registration and reregistration process can be very costly. Over time, the amount of data needed has increased as well as the ability to test for the presence of pesticides and their effects in order to ensure a safe food supply. The legislation is designed to minimize the likelihood that a safe chemical will be taken off the market simply because the manufacturer does not want to incur the added costs of generating additional data for EPA registration. We need to have a reasonable process for small scale use of pesticides that safeguards the environment and people's health but does not end up taking necessary and safe pesticides off the market.

I believe that many more changes are needed to improve the regulation of pesticides and minor crops, such as increased funding for the agricultural interregional project for data collection in support of minor-use registration [the IR-4 project]. This program, which I strongly support, is paramount to the future successful maintenance of minor use registrations.

It is my understanding that this legislation will be considered as part of a broader bill to reauthorize the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act [FIFRA] this year. I look forward to working with the members on the committee in addressing these important issues.

#### ISRAEL LOAN GUARANTEE

**HON. GARY A. FRANKS**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 3, 1992

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, Israel has requested \$10 billion in loan guarantees from the United States Government. I support the guarantee of these loans and urge my colleagues in the U.S. Congress to see the immediate need for their approval.

Mr. Speaker, Israel has absorbed over a million refugees from the former Soviet Union and Ethiopia. The economic ramifications of clothing and housing these people could prove disastrous, the cost to Israel being between \$45 and \$50 billion over the next 5 years. The refugees have been arriving in numbers way beyond what Israel can handle in such a short period of time.

On September 6, 1991, the administration asked Congress to delay consideration of the loan guarantees for 120 days so as to allow the peace talks to begin with one less barrier. The 120 days are up and it is time to keep a promise, not only to the Congress but to the Israeli Government.

The loan guarantees are not direct loans as some in Congress have indicated. In fact, they are guarantees that the Israeli Government can get loans at a lower interest rate from banks. Legislation would stipulate that Israel pay back the full amount of the loans as well as administrative costs. I have been concerned with the provision in the 1990 budget agreement that stated funds had to be set aside so as to "insure" these loans, but if Israel's payments include this sum, as they have indicated, then there would in fact be no cost to the United States Government.

Mr. Speaker, the risk of these loans should not be of grave concern. Israel has been rated highly favorable and has never defaulted on a loan and never received debt forgiveness from the United States Government.

However, the guarantee of these loans is not only a humanitarian issue but one of national security. Israel has historically been a very strong and much needed ally, as we witnessed in the Persian Gulf war. In a region that is riddled with conflict and violence it is imperative for the United States to maintain an alliance on which we can rely.

The increased rate at which certain Arab countries are arming themselves, coupled with the rising mood of Islamic fundamentalism, threatens not only Israel, but American interests in the Persian Gulf as well. Further, if the peace process is to remain an integral part of our country's foreign policy, which it must, then we should not favor one country over another. Last year the United States gave \$4 billion in loan guarantees to Arab countries. Israel has requested \$2 billion a year over 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has switched its position again. Despite its commitment to consider the loan guarantees after the 120 days were up, they have again been stalled, this time because of their concern with settlements. However, settlements should not be an issue in the granting of loan guarantees.

Albeit the settlements are an integral ingredient in any solution that could resolve the



Arab-Israeli conflict but it is not an issue that the United States should be deciding. If we could find a solution regarding the settlements then the peace process would be unnecessary. The land-for-peace issue has been the primary concern between Israel and its Arab neighbors and the administration has shrouded land for peace behind a curtain of settlements.

Mr. Speaker, Israel has committed not to use the money received from loan guarantees to build settlements in the West Bank or Gaza. Therefore the United States involvement should be to preserve and encourage a solution, not become a barrier to one. As a supporter of the loan guarantees to Israel I certainly hope that Congress will realize the humanitarian and national security ramifications of not granting the guarantees. While the cold war has ended, regional conflicts have not and we should not alienate a long time ally.

#### DEBATE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

**HON. LES ASPIN**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 3, 1992

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, we are in danger of losing something we urgently need in these times of historic change—the ability to have a rational, intellectually honest debate on national security.

We are all aware that the whole basis for our national security planning has been changed. These historic times demand that we think freshly about what we require to defend ourselves—to defend ourselves in the broadest sense—in this new, post-cold war, post-Soviet world. This House has been doing that.

When Iraq invaded Kuwait in August 1990, the Nation faced its first, great post-cold war national security challenge. This House faced that challenge in the classic form devised in our Constitution—a vote on whether to authorize the President to use the force of arms. The debate that accompanied that vote represented some of the finest hours of this body as Members spoke eloquently to their convictions about the Nation and what it stood for. The House voted to authorize the use of force to expel the invaders and our men and women in uniform went on to win a historic victory in Operation Desert Storm.

Today, we are again engaged in a national security debate of enormous importance. It centers on the first true post-Soviet defense budget, that for fiscal year 1993, but it extends beyond that to the kind of defense we will need at the turn of the century. This House is again meeting the challenge. So far, we have passed a budget resolution that contains numbers for defense that arise from a rigorous analysis, from the ground up, of the threats we face and the size of the forces we need to meet those threats. Reasonable men and women can and do disagree about those numbers. But the defense figures in our resolution are the product of a serious, substantive process, one the House can take some pride in.

We must see to it that the process stays serious and substantive. There are those who would have it otherwise. In the heat of the

budget battles, it would be easy to fall into the traps of the past. We must not permit the "Weinbergerization" of the defense debate. Most of us remember the days of Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger. The early Reagan administration years were marked by a very large peacetime defense buildup, but Cap was quick to predict utter ruin if Congress deviated from his program.

In 1983, for instance, he claimed that congressional cuts in the rate of increase would cause reductions in the number of Army and Marine divisions, and Air Force fighter wings. Carrier task forces would no longer be able to cruise the Indian Ocean and one of our carriers would have to come home from the Mediterranean. We cut and none of these things happened.

In 1985, when Congress sought to slow the steep rise in defense spending, Cap predicted that "such reductions could lead us back into the situation of the late 1970s, with a military establishment clearly unable to meet the Nation's commitments." Congress did stop the increases and, of course, these dire consequences did not happen.

This sort of thing cost Cap dearly. Eventually, he "Weinbergerized" himself out of the debate. His claims simply weren't credible. But it took a while. This time, we don't want to wait so long for reality to intrude. Mr. Speaker, this defense debate must have an element often lacking in the past—accountability.

I believe I have done my part. When I made my recommendations to the budget committee on fiscal year 1993 defense spending levels, I made plain the origins of those recommendations. I established a methodology for estimating the threat, and for gauging U.S. military capabilities. And I made those methodologies public. I also made plain at the time that this process did not automatically yield one, correct defense plan. It was designed to generate a substantive debate on the military requirements for the United States in this new era. It enables members to make their own judgments about the defense we need and how much we ought to spend to get it. My own judgment based on this methodology is that we can cut about twice as many dollars in fiscal year 1993 as the Bush administration and have a defense better than the one it proposes.

But in response to this effort, we have seen the revival of Weinbergerization. The Pentagon has produced a script with two main themes. The first is that if we mark up a defense authorization bill to the House Budget Resolution defense numbers it will force cuts of 300,000 more uniformed personnel positions in fiscal year 1993 than the administration has already proposed. The second is that funds in operation and maintenance accounts, including training, will be cut so severely under the House numbers that training accidents will increase in peacetime and casualties will increase in wartime.

Dick Cheney, Cap Weinberger's successor once removed, told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that "the only way to get savings of this magnitude"—the House numbers, in other words—"in a short period of time is for me to fire 300,000 active duty military people" over what is already planned.

We saw this script in action during the House debate on the budget just about 3

weeks ago. The gentleman from Illinois, the Republican leader, read from it. He said, and I quote, "If the Democrats' defense budget becomes a reality, an extra 300,000 active duty military personnel would have to be cut in 1993."

General Merrill McPeak, the chief of staff of the Air Force, has done a little ad libbing on his script. He talked about the impact of the House budget numbers in early March. He said, and I quote again, "What you would have to do is close down the Air Force. You might as well let all the people go." I want to let General McPeak know now that I'm going to ask him about this next fall. I want him to have time to figure out how to climb back down from the preposterous limb on which he's placed himself.

Last week, we saw the Pentagon material in testimony for the Senate Armed Services Committee prepared by the Pentagon apparatus for release under the name of General Colin Powell, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Cap Weinberger claimed vastly overblown consequences for defense cuts to protect his defense budgets. After seeing this material from the Pentagon, I'm tempted to paraphrase Ronald Reagan. There they go again.

I've also found an example of the kind of civil, principled debate and disagreement that generates light instead of heat. This also from my good friend Colin Powell. I have examined the transcript of his actual testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Colin Powell is a tough but fair advocate for his positions in person. But his prepared testimony contains some of the worst examples of Weinbergerization. I don't know what to make of this performance. I think I'd like the real Colin Powell to stand up.

But now let me deal with the substance of the Pentagon line. First, the charge that we'll cause an additional 300,000 in active duty cuts next fiscal year. When I recommended defense budget numbers for fiscal year 1993 to the House Budget Committee for inclusion in the budget resolution, I had in mind how we would handle those cuts in my chairman's mark of the fiscal year 1993 defense authorization bill. Those cuts do not include personnel cuts beyond those in the administration proposal.

Let's put it in perspective. The Bush-Cheney budget for fiscal year 1993 asks for \$291.4 billion in outlays. The House Budget Resolution would cut \$5.2 billion from that figure, or 1.8 percent.

The Pentagon says this 1.8 percent cut would cause the dismissal of an additional 300,000 service members. General Powell's prepared testimony says this would "devastate the all volunteer force." That's vintage Cap Weinberger. You'll recall that Cap would say things like we were going to lose the equivalent of the U.S. Marine Corps if we made cuts. That claim was silly then and this one is silly now.

It's also doubly shortsighted. This is not one of those issues in which the two sides make mutually exclusive assertions, then walk off and forget it. The folks behind the Pentagon campaign don't seem to realize that they're going to be proved wrong in a matter of weeks.

Let me tell you how I will demonstrate that this claim is wrong. The House Armed Services Committee will write a defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1993 to the numbers in the House Budget Resolution. That bill will provide a strong defense for America and it will make no military personnel cuts greater than those proposed by the Bush Administration for fiscal year 1993.

When we do this in May, I am going to point it out as strongly as I can. And when the House approves this defense authorization bill in June, I am going to point it out again, as strongly as I can. And when the defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1993 receives final approval next fall, I am going to point it out again. We are going to have a lot of accountability.

Let's take the second theme, the one about cuts in operation and maintenance accounts. These accounts pay for training, among many other things. The Pentagon says that the cuts in operation and maintenance could be so severe under the House Budget Resolution that training will decrease greatly and the readiness of our forces to fight will be impaired. General Powell's prepared testimony takes a grotesquely distorted view of O&M cuts and goes so far as to say—and I quote—"Cuts of this enormity are easy to translate: They would result in higher American casualties the next time we go to war. They would also mean higher casualties during peacetime"—end quote—through training accidents.

This is too much. It's Weinbergerization at its worst. Can it really be possible that the Pentagon can't think of anywhere to make cuts except places where they increase the chances that our men and women in uniform will die in accidents? If they can't, we at the House Armed Services Committee can and will.

We know where to look for our operation and maintenance cuts. We're going to look at overseas spending for cuts. We're going to look at unnecessary overhead for cuts and we're going to look at excess stocks for cuts. The House Armed Services Committee will demonstrate that this claim, too, is unfounded with a bill that will protect training and the real combat readiness of our forces while cutting unneeded spending out of a military establishment bigger than we need for the threats we face today.

When we write that bill that protects training and real readiness, I'm going to point it out strongly. And again when it passes the House and again when it finally passes the Congress. Again, accountability.

But in the meantime, I want to assure my House colleagues that the tool I've offered them for asking the right questions about future force structure is a sound one. The Pentagon is shooting at it and we have plenty of ammunition to return fire.

In fact, this part of the debate raises another kind of Weinbergerization. This tactic involves making claims on the public record that are known to be contradicted in classified information. It puts those of us who know the facts on the spot. We can put up with the distortions and misrepresentations, or we can reveal classified information. I want to put the Pentagon on notice that I'm not going to sit by while these misrepresentations are promoted publicly.

For instance, there is the basic Desert Storm Equivalent. This is the force that could tackle a fight the size we were in with Iraq and win handily. It is built on what we call the force that mattered in the war with Iraq, plus additional forces to beef it up. It includes 6 heavy divisions, an air assault division, an air-trans- portable light division, 1 Marine division-wing on land and in excess of 1 brigade at sea, 24 Air Force fighter squadrons, 3 squadrons of defense suppression and reconnaissance aircraft. It includes 70 heavy bombers, and 2 early-arriving carrier battle groups building up over time to 4 carrier battle groups, including surface combatants providing Aegis defenses and capability for launching large numbers of cruise missiles.

General McPeak has had some things to say about the adequacy of the Air Force component of this basic building block. He says the U.S. deployed 33 squadrons to the war and had the substantial help of allied air forces. So he says, and again I quote, the "Desert Storm Equivalent is not a Desert Storm Equivalent. I call it Desert Drizzle."

I can only conclude that General McPeak has not been reading the Pentagon's own classified scenarios for a renewed conflict in Southwest Asia. If he had, I hope a respect for the facts would make him change his tune. I can't go into detail here, but the classified documents say McPeak is wrong and the Desert Storm Equivalent could do the job.

Using our threat assessments and our building blocks, we built four illustrative U.S. force structure options. All are heavy on airlift and sealift, the two largest options having more lift than the Bush-Cheney base force.

Option A would permit us to handle one Iraq-sized contingency and a sizable humanitarian relief effort. Option B would add forces to handle option A contingencies plus a regional contingency such as a conflict in Korea. General Powell says these provide "just enough forces to respond to the contingencies postulated in each" with no strategic reserve. Fair enough. They are austere.

Option C would accomplish the missions of options A and B, and add the ability to handle a Panama-takeover sized contingency, plus a rotation base for a long-term deployment short of war. I personally believe that capabilities like these are about what we need in the late 1990's. Option D is a more robust version of option C.

The Pentagon line is that option C could not accomplish all it purports to simultaneously. In fact, it's been said that the bigger base force being promoted by the administration couldn't do it all. Actually, the base force could if enough airlift and sealift were provided to get the forces and their war materiel where they are needed when they are needed. Option C can now.

Option C would total about 1.4 million men and women in uniform by 1997. The base force would total about 1.6 million by 1995. Not as big a difference as you might think, given all the complaints. The reason is that option C builds in the lift, and support forces to make its combat forces count. The base force saves more slots for generals, but leaves a portion of its combat forces all dressed up with no way to get to the fight.

We began this bottom-up exercise by asking what threats we face in this new, post-Soviet

world. The Pentagon said that was the wrong way to do it. The Pentagon said the force of the future had to be big enough to handle uncertainty, and it was anyone's guess how big that was. Since then, we've learned from the New York Times that the Pentagon builds classified threat scenarios when it really wants to know what it needs to fight.

The New York Times reported recently that seven such scenarios dominated budget guidance to the military services for fiscal year 1994. The Pentagon is using threat analysis internally to shape future budgets while claiming publicly that it will not work. We say it will. If the seven scenarios written as fiscal year 1994 budget guidance were part of the public debate, I suspect it would thoroughly validate the Desert Storm equivalent, the basic building block in my force options.

Mr. Speaker, we can safely reduce our forces below the levels proposed in the Bush-Cheney budget. It would be an enormous help if we could do it after a serious, substantive debate, not a Weinbergerized one.

I want to close now with one more reason for foregoing a Weinbergerized debate. Our men and women in uniform are our most precious national security resource. They have made and will make sacrifices for their country. We must keep the faith with them. Yet we have seen this fiction of the 300,000 additional dismissals for fiscal year 1992 floated time and again. This sort of thing creates turmoil and unnecessary anxiety among the very people for whom we should be showing the most concern. The Pentagon ought to stop it. It's not right.

A TRIBUTE TO SADIE T.M. ALEXANDER: A CHAMPION OF PHILADELPHIA

### HON. LUCIEN E. BLACKWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 3, 1992

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely delighted to memorialize a phenomenal woman who has done so much to inspire so many in the city of Philadelphia and throughout the country, the late great Sadie T.M. Alexander.

Ms. Alexander's outstanding devotion to community service and sisterhood made her a beacon for uplifting the status of black women in America.

Born in Philadelphia, PA, in 1898, the daughter of Aaron Mossell and Mary Turner, Sadie Alexander strived for excellence in all that she did.

Ms. Alexander is noted for being not only the best, but also the first in a long list of achievements. She was the first black woman to graduate from the law school at the University of Pennsylvania, pass the Pennsylvania bar exam, establish a law practice in Pennsylvania, and receive a doctorate degree in economics. In addition, she helped to establish the National Bar Association.

Her dedication to service can best be exemplified in the role she played as the first national president of one of the leading organizations for black women, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority.



She became a member of the Gamma Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta in 1917. After joining, her loyalty to the sorority manifested itself in many ways. She helped to convene the first national convention in 1919, started the May Week Program—which was an incentive for black students to continue their education—directed the sorority's first academic scholarship, and operated the headquarters from her own home.

The results of Sadie T.M. Alexander's hard work can be seen today. Many of the programs she helped to implement are still operating successfully.

Mr. Speaker, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority must be commended for pioneering such a champion. The miraculous works of Sadie T.M. Alexander must be hailed in American history. She is definitely a role model for all women.

I would be remiss, if I were not to pay homage to Sadie T.M. Alexander and Delta Sigma Theta Sorority. The commitment that this great organization has made to education and community service cannot be overlooked.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that Sadie T.M. Alexander is one of the most outstanding black Americans of our time.

**TRIBUTE TO DR. GORDON GUYER:  
SCIENTIST AND ADMINISTRATOR**

**HON. BOB CARR**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, April 3, 1992*

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, since I was first elected to Congress in 1974, I have had the privilege of representing Michigan State University in East Lansing, MI. During that time I have come to know numerous distinguished individuals associated with that institution. And as the years have passed on, I have regretfully come to see a number of them retire. And few of them have had as much personal impact on me as Gordon Guyer.

The individual I rise to honor today has an association with Michigan State University both long and distinguished. It was 1947 when Gordon Guyer first came to East Lansing as a student. He earned three degrees from the university—has baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral degrees in entomology—and served in a variety of leadership roles.

As an entomologist, he focused on developing safe methods of limiting insect damage to crops, and was among the first American scientists to visit China in the mid-1970's. Working with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Dr. Guyer has served in Australia, China, Brazil, and Africa. Author of more than 70 scientific papers, he has ranged widely over the subjects of international agriculture policy, aquatic ecology, as well as his area of greatest expertise, integrated pest control technology.

As he was conducting a research project in Africa in 1973, he was first tapped for an administrative post: director of the Michigan State University Cooperative Extension Service. He served in that post until 1984, "putting the land-grant university to work in every one of Michigan's 83 counties," as he told the Lan-

sing State-Journal recently. One of the highlights of his service to CES was development of a successful 4-H program into urban Detroit.

When Gordon left his post at CES, he intended to give his full attention to entomology, as director of the Kellogg biological station from 1982 to 1985. But then Gov. James Blanchard tapped Guyer to direct the State's Department of Natural Resources. Anxious to return to science, he left that post only to be called upon again by Michigan State, to lead the university's governmental affairs unit after his long-time colleague and friend Jack Breslin, passed on.

Now Gordon is once again ready to move on, but this time to devote more time to W.K. Kellogg Foundation education projects in Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic.

And personally, he has provided a positive example. The way he treats everyone with respect and kindness has earned him a universe of friends and admirers—of which I'm a particular fan—and few, if any, enemies.

I take this opportunity to add to the hundreds of awards and citations Gordon has received with the deepest gratitude of the people of Michigan for his service. I want to wish Gordon and his lovely wife Norma every possible joy in his retirement. He will be missed by those of us who had the privilege to work with him.

**TRIBUTE TO THE DAILY  
CARDINAL NEWSPAPER**

**HON. SCOTT L. KLUG**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, April 3, 1992*

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Daily Cardinal newspaper at the University of Wisconsin—Madison. On Saturday, April 4, 1992, the Daily Cardinal will celebrate the 100th anniversary of its first publication. I am honored to have this opportunity to pay tribute to one of the finest and oldest campus dailies in the country.

Throughout the years, the Daily Cardinal has distinguished itself as a student newspaper determined to bringing a level of professionalism to journalism that is unmatched at the collegiate level. The Cardinal not only reports on a wide array of campuswide topics, but has prided itself on educating the University of Wisconsin—Madison campus on worldwide events and their implications locally.

The Daily Cardinal first broke onto the national scene during the 1960's and played an active and courageous role in opposing the war in Vietnam. The Cardinal has continued its activist theme by often focusing its efforts on controversial topics such as racism, sexual abuse, and an ongoing battle for a diverse and peaceful multicultural society. The opinion page tackles all debatable subjects and anyone or anything considered the establishment—beware. When I was a graduate student at the university, I always looked forward to the paper's next edition.

Happy Birthday Daily Cardinal. Best of luck in your next 100 years.

**FLEET SAFETY AWARD WINNER**

**HON. WAYNE OWENS**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, April 3, 1992*

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a singular accomplishment. This week, C.R. England & Sons, a truckload motor carrier headquartered in Salt Lake City was awarded the prestigious grand prize trophy in the 1991 fleet safety contest. The trophy was given by the Interstate Truckload Carriers Conference.

The conference represents the truckload, irregular route, common, and contract motor carriers of the United States and is affiliated with the American Trucking Associations.

Mr. Daniel England, chief executive officer of C.R. England & Sons, was presented this award at the conference's annual meeting. The annual fleet safety contest is a competition between the 575 carrier members of the conference to determine which company has the best safety record and safety program from the preceding year. C.R. England & Sons drivers log more than 100 million miles annually, and to be judged the best from among their peers in the important field of highway safety is a great tribute.

All the more significant is the fact that this is the second time in the past 3 years that C.R. England & Sons has been given this trophy. For years the company has been active in promoting highway safety in Utah. It is fitting that C.R. England & Sons has been nationally recognized once again for its exemplary achievements.

**THE 21ST ANNUAL HUMAN RELATIONS AWARDS OF THE NASHVILLE CHAPTER OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS**

**HON. BOB CLEMENT**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, April 3, 1992*

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening, April 9, the board of directors of the Nashville chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews will award to four distinguished citizens in our community the 1992 Human Relations Award. I would like to join their friends and neighbors in congratulating the four award recipients—Charles O. Frazier, Suzanne J. Morris, and McDonald and Jamye Williams. All are truly deserving of this fine tribute.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and its Nashville chapter, are dedicated to promoting civic cooperation and mutual understanding among all people, regardless of religion, race, or ethnic background. This commitment to human rights is symbolized by the Human Relations Award, which is presented annually to recipients whose achievements have helped our community realize its ultimate goal of "One nation under God . . . with liberty and justice for all."

This quote from our Pledge of Allegiance is a most appropriate place to begin to praise the career of Dr. Charles O. Frazier. I am sure that in the last 38 years not a day began for Dr. Frazier without these words being said, either by himself, the many teachers under his leadership, or the thousands of students under his charge.

But as a teacher of social science and math and as director of schools, Dr. Frazier had dedicated his life to educating children and youth and teaching them the value of tolerance, respect, cooperation, and confidence. He has successfully led our public schools through a period of great change in American education and in our society at large. His achievements have been recognized by many professional and community awards and, as he retires as director of the metro schools, it is only fitting that he receive the Human Relations Award.

Suzanne J. Morris has also been a leader in our community and an example to us all. Her civic and cultural involvement has genuinely made our community stronger. As an active member of many civic organizations, including the Metro Charitable Solicitation Board and Leadership Nashville, and as past president of the Dede Wallace Mental Health Center and the National Council of Jewish Women, Su-

zanne has reached out to all parts of the city. She has worked vigorously to break down the many racial and social barriers that divide us, utilizing her many skills to bring diverse groups together for the common good. As a native Nashvillian and successful businesswoman, she has dedicated a lifetime of good work to our city and to our citizens and we all thank her for making Nashville one of the best places in our Nation to live.

McDonald and Jamye Williams are a most extraordinary couple in our community. Individually and together, they have distinguished themselves as exemplary leaders in the fields of education and religion. Both taught at Tennessee State University from 1958 to 1988 and have as a living legacy the many students who listened to their lessons in literature, communications, and life itself. Both were active in the civil rights movement of the 1960's and authored "The Negro Speaks: The Rhetoric of Contemporary Black Leaders" (1970), which was adopted as an approved supplementary text for the schools in Tennessee.

Both have been active members of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. Jamye, for example, is the first woman elected a major general officer in the 205-year history of the church, as well as the elected editor of the AME Church Review. McDonald is associate

editor of this journal and a member of his church's board. Each has made an important contribution to our community through their many civic and charitable activities, particularly those directed at helping the young and those less fortunate or unable to care for themselves. But, whether taken as individuals or as a couple, McDonald and Jamye Williams are invaluable members of our community who have looked at life as an opportunity to do good for others. We thank them and congratulate them for their generosity.

Mr. Speaker, these four individuals have used their many talents wisely in education, race relations, and religious harmony. Through their individual and concerted efforts, they have helped bridge the natural differences caused by the great diversity in our community. They have worked tirelessly to foster understanding and to eradicate bigotry and intolerance.

The Human Relations Award they are to receive from the Nashville chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews is a token of recognition and appreciation. I am pleased to join my fellow citizens in congratulating Charles O. Frazier, Suzanne J. Morris, and McDonald and Jamye Williams.

COMMITTEE ON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
HEARING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
ON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to discuss the work of the House of Representatives. The House is the most visible branch of the Federal Government, and its actions are closely watched by the American people.

The House has a long and distinguished history, and it has played a vital role in the development of the United States. It is my honor to represent the people of my district, and I am committed to serving them with integrity and dedication.

The House is a place where ideas are debated and decisions are made. It is a place where the voices of the people are heard, and where the interests of the Nation are protected.

I am proud to be a member of the House, and I am committed to the principles of democracy and the rule of law. I will continue to work hard to serve the people of my district and the Nation as a whole.

The House is a place of great responsibility, and I am grateful for the trust that my constituents have placed in me. I will continue to strive for excellence in my work, and I will always put the interests of the people first.

I am honored to be a part of the House of Representatives, and I am committed to the principles of democracy and the rule of law. I will continue to work hard to serve the people of my district and the Nation as a whole.

The House is a place of great responsibility, and I am grateful for the trust that my constituents have placed in me. I will continue to strive for excellence in my work, and I will always put the interests of the people first.

I am honored to be a part of the House of Representatives, and I am committed to the principles of democracy and the rule of law. I will continue to work hard to serve the people of my district and the Nation as a whole.

the House is a place of great responsibility, and I am grateful for the trust that my constituents have placed in me. I will continue to strive for excellence in my work, and I will always put the interests of the people first.

I am honored to be a part of the House of Representatives, and I am committed to the principles of democracy and the rule of law. I will continue to work hard to serve the people of my district and the Nation as a whole.

The House is a place of great responsibility, and I am grateful for the trust that my constituents have placed in me. I will continue to strive for excellence in my work, and I will always put the interests of the people first.

I am honored to be a part of the House of Representatives, and I am committed to the principles of democracy and the rule of law. I will continue to work hard to serve the people of my district and the Nation as a whole.

The House is a place of great responsibility, and I am grateful for the trust that my constituents have placed in me. I will continue to strive for excellence in my work, and I will always put the interests of the people first.

I am honored to be a part of the House of Representatives, and I am committed to the principles of democracy and the rule of law. I will continue to work hard to serve the people of my district and the Nation as a whole.

The House is a place of great responsibility, and I am grateful for the trust that my constituents have placed in me. I will continue to strive for excellence in my work, and I will always put the interests of the people first.

I am honored to be a part of the House of Representatives, and I am committed to the principles of democracy and the rule of law. I will continue to work hard to serve the people of my district and the Nation as a whole.

The House is a place of great responsibility, and I am grateful for the trust that my constituents have placed in me. I will continue to strive for excellence in my work, and I will always put the interests of the people first.

the House is a place of great responsibility, and I am grateful for the trust that my constituents have placed in me. I will continue to strive for excellence in my work, and I will always put the interests of the people first.

I am honored to be a part of the House of Representatives, and I am committed to the principles of democracy and the rule of law. I will continue to work hard to serve the people of my district and the Nation as a whole.

The House is a place of great responsibility, and I am grateful for the trust that my constituents have placed in me. I will continue to strive for excellence in my work, and I will always put the interests of the people first.

I am honored to be a part of the House of Representatives, and I am committed to the principles of democracy and the rule of law. I will continue to work hard to serve the people of my district and the Nation as a whole.

The House is a place of great responsibility, and I am grateful for the trust that my constituents have placed in me. I will continue to strive for excellence in my work, and I will always put the interests of the people first.

I am honored to be a part of the House of Representatives, and I am committed to the principles of democracy and the rule of law. I will continue to work hard to serve the people of my district and the Nation as a whole.

The House is a place of great responsibility, and I am grateful for the trust that my constituents have placed in me. I will continue to strive for excellence in my work, and I will always put the interests of the people first.

I am honored to be a part of the House of Representatives, and I am committed to the principles of democracy and the rule of law. I will continue to work hard to serve the people of my district and the Nation as a whole.

The House is a place of great responsibility, and I am grateful for the trust that my constituents have placed in me. I will continue to strive for excellence in my work, and I will always put the interests of the people first.